

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ELLIOT ROLLINGS-PLEASANT,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-03-0228 MCE PAN P

vs.

DEUEL VOCATIONAL
INSTITUTION, et al.,

Defendants,

ORDER

Plaintiff moves to modify the February 21, 2006, scheduling order.

A schedule may be modified only upon a showing of good cause. Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b). Good cause exists when the moving party demonstrates he cannot meet the deadline despite exercising due diligence. Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992). Pursuant to the scheduling order discovery closes June 16, 2006. Plaintiff asserts he cannot timely complete discovery because he is inexperienced in the law and he has limited access to the law library. Plaintiff asserts he needs an additional 120 days beyond the date discovery closes “to obtain the proper responses or answers to requests for admission, interrogatories and/or the appropriate documents” so he can prepare a motion for summary judgment or properly oppose such a motion.

////

1 Plaintiff does not explain what discovery he has conducted and does not show
2 what discovery he needs to do.

3 Plaintiff fails to demonstrate he is unable to meet the deadline despite due
4 diligence.

5 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's May 12, 2006, request
6 for extension is denied.

7 DATED: May 31, 2006.

8
9 
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

11 \004
12 \roll0228. dny modif sched
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26